UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/455,964	12/06/1999	RICHARD QIAN	KLR:7146.048	5789

47915 7590 03/14/2006	EXAMINER
CHERNOFF, VILHAUER, MCCLUNG & STENZEL, LLP	HUYNH, SON P
1600 ODS TOWER	

	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
601 SW SECOND AVENUE	2611	
PORTLAND, OR 97204		

DATE MAILED: 03/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	09/455,964	QIAN ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Son P. Huynh	2617	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>03</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *13 December 2005*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-12* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1.   Applicant's arguments with respect to amended claims 1-12 have been

considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Applicant argues Boyer does not disclose, "creating a summary of said identified portion

of said video in response to said extraction of the datum." (Page 5, paragraph 3).

In response, this argument is respectfully traversed. Boyer discloses a web browser

creates and displays web pages that includes summary of the identified portion of video

such as images, title, relative to the video clips, interview segments, etc. to the video to

the user in response to user selection of the option (see including, but are not limited to,

figures 30, 32-33, paragraphs 0105, 0119-0129). Therefore, the claimed feature of

"creating a summary of said identified portion of said video in response to said

extraction of the datum" is broadly interpreted as creating a summary such as image,

title, etc. related to the video clips, interview segments of the video (by web browser for

display) in response to the extraction of datum related to images of video clip, video

interview, etc. used to generate title, image, etc. for display on the web page.

Applicant further states independent claim 7 has been amended to include the limitation

of "extracting said identified portions of said video from said video to form said video

abstraction in response to the location of said index;" claim 11 has been amended to

include the limitation of "extracting said content related to said semantic event from said

video in response to extraction of said datum from said video for inclusion in said

semantic summary including at least one portion of said video" (page 5 last paragraph

to page 6, line 1). Applicant further argues Boyer's discloses using display options of a

video programming guide such as "by channel" or "by category" to extract, from the

video, portions of the video to be display....., is not possible as the portion video ready

to be displayed in the program guide must be extracted and abstracted prior to a user

accessing those abstractions by selecting display options (page 6, lines 1-8).

The amended limitation of claim 7 "extracting said identified portions of said

video from said video to form said video abstraction in response to the location of said

index;" is broadly interpreted as Boyer's disclosure of extracting video clips, interview

segments, etc. from the video program to form video information page in response to

the location of program title, channel, running time, broadcast station, image, etc. – see

including, but are not limited to figures 16, 23, 26, 30, 32-33, paragraphs 0119-0129).

Boyer discloses the images, video clips, interview segments, etc. and related

information is not created by the web browser for display on the screen in response to

user selection of desired option (see including, but are not limited to, figures 30, 32-33,

paragraphs 0105, 0119-0129). Inherently, the content related to the semantic event

from the video is extracted in response to extraction of the datum for inclusion in the

semantic summary including at least one portion of the video (extraction of datum for image, title, etc. from the video for inclusion in the image, title, etc. including image of the video – figures 24, 29, 30, 32-33).

Claim 12 has been amended to include the limitation "extracting said identified portions of said video from said video to form said video abstraction" (claim 12, lines 8-9). Boyer discloses in response to user selection of an option, the web browser creates image, video clips, title, preview, etc. of the video etc. for display on the screen (figures 24, 29, 30, 32-33, paragraphs 0119-0129). Inherently, the identified portions of the video (e.g. preview, title, image, etc. of the video) are extracted from the video to form video abstraction so that the image, title, video clip, preview, etc. of the video are displayed on the screen as video abstraction.

For the reason given above, rejections on claims 1-12 are analyzed as discussed below.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

2.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2)
of such treaty in the English language.

3.   Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Boyer

et al. (US 2003/0066085 A1).

Regarding claim 1, Boyer discloses providing a program listing information from a

source (internet) different from the video source (figure 3). The Internet program guide

provides user with different options to select an identified video program. If a particular

title icon, channel icon, in the Internet program guide is selected, information such as

images (figure 24) of the selected video program is displayed. The information, such as

images in the video program, allows user to obtain additional information such as video

clips, interview segments, etc. of the selected video (figures 23-24, 28,30, par. 0119-

par. 0124). Therefore, the method of creating a semantic summary of the video as

claimed in claim 1 is broadly met by Boyer's disclosure as analyzed as discussed

below.

        "identifying a domain of said video" is broadly met by identifying by time, by

channel, by category, etc. of the video (figure 15);

        "using said domain to locate information related to said video at a source other

than said video;" is broadly met by using by time, by channel, by category, etc., to locate

information related to the video from Internet – (e.g. using By TIME - figure 16);

        "extracting a datum related to a semantic event from said information, said

semantic event describing a portion of said video" is broadly met by extracting a datum

of the information related to a semantic event (e.g. datum of the information related to

images of video clips, video interview, episodes, etc.) from information of Internet

program guide, the images describing video clips, video interview segments, etc. –

figures 30, 32-33; par. 0121-par. 0129);

"identifying said portion of said video related to said datum" is broadly met by

identifying a portions such as video clips, interview segments, etc. of the selected video

(figures 30,32-33, par. 0121-0129; and

"creating a summary of said identified portion of said video in response to the

extraction of said datum" is broadly interpreted as creating (by web browser) a summary

such as image, title, etc. related to the video clips, interview segments of the video in

response to the extraction of datum related to images of video clip, video interview, etc.

used to generate title, image, etc. for display on the web page. (figures 30,32-33, par.

0121-0129).

Regarding claim 2, Boyer further discloses title of events in Internet program guide or

textual summary of event in information box 236 (figure 16) broadly reads on the

claimed feature of "the information is a textual summary of events".

Regarding claim 3, Boyer further teaches the information is included in a worldwide web

site (e.g., program guide 218 is a web page provided from web server 86 – figure 3).

Regarding claim 4, Boyer further teaches the information is included in an electronic

program guide (figures 16, 20, 22, 26-27, 30).

Regarding claim 5, Boyer further teaches the domain is identified from an electronic

program guide (e.g., Time page 218 in figure 16 is identified from program guide option

in figure 15 – par. 0102).

Regarding claim 6, Boyer further teaches displaying the summary to a user (e.g.

displaying title, image, etc. to user – par. 0119-par. 0129, figures 24, 30, 32-33).

Regarding claim 7, Boyer teaches a method of abstracting video comprising the steps

of:

　　　　locating an index of the video from a source external to the video (locating video

information such as title, running time, channel, etc. of the video from data server 82,

figure 3 and par. 0065);

　　　　identifying a domain of the video for creating a video abstraction (e.g., identifying

By TIME page option of the video for creating a video program guide By Time – figures

15-16, and par. 0089);

　　　　using the domain together with the index to identify portions of the video for

inclusion in the video abstraction (e.g. using the "By TIME" program guide together with

program information such as title, actor, etc. to identify video clips, video interview

segments, episode, etc.) for inclusion in video abstraction – figure 16 and par. 0105,

par. 0119-par. 0129);

extracting the identified portions of the video from the video to form the video

abstraction in response to the location of the index (e.g. extracting video clips, interview

segments, etc. from the video program to form video information page in response to

the location of title, image, channel, etc. – figures 16, 23, 26, 30, 32-33 and par. 0119-

0129); and

displaying the video abstraction to a user (displaying video information pages

which contains program title, images related to video clips, interview segments, etc. to

user -figures 30,32-33, par. 0121-0129).

Regarding claim 8, Boyer further discloses the index is included in a worldwide web site

(program information such as program titles, channels, etc. is included in the Internet

pages receives from Internet source– figure 3).

Regarding claim 9, Boyer further teaches the index is included in an electronic program

guide (e.g., program title, running time, channel, etc. is included in page 218 – figure

16).

Regarding claim 10, Boyer further teaches the step of identification of the domain by a

use of the abstraction (e.g. user selects By Time from program guide- figures 15-16).

Regarding claim 11, Boyer discloses providing a program listing information from a

source (internet) different from the video source (figure 3). The Internet program guide

comprises textual summary such as title, brief description, etc. of the video program.

The Internet program guide provides user with different options to select an identified

video program. If a particular title icon, channel icon, in the Internet program guide is

selected, information such as images (figure 24) of the selected video program is

displayed. The information, such as images in the video program, allows user to obtain

additional information such as video clips, interview segments, etc. of the selected video

(figures 23-24, 28,30, par. 0119-par. 0124). Therefore, the method of creating a

semantic summary of the video as claimed is broadly met by Boyer's disclosure as

analyzed as discussed below.

"identifying a domain of said video" is broadly met by identifying by Time, by

Channel, by Category, etc. of the video (figure 15);

"using said domain to locate a textual summary of said video;" is broadly met by

using by Time, by Channel, by Category, etc., to locate title, brief description, actor,

director, etc. of the identified video in the program guide information–figures

15,16,23,26-28,30-33, par. 0119-0129);

"extracting a datum related to a semantic event relevant to said video summary

from said textual information" is broadly met by extracting a datum related to a semantic

event (e.g. datum of the information related to images of video clips, video interview,

episodes, etc.) from textual information of Internet program guide– figures 30, 32-33;

par. 0121-par. 0129);

"locating content in said video corresponding to said datum; is broadly met by locating the video clips, interview segments, etc., corresponding to the datum of image (figures 23-24, 29, par. 0119-0129);

"extracting said content related to said semantic event from said video in response to extraction of said datum from said video for inclusion in said semantic summary including at least one portion of said video" is broadly met by extracting the content related to images, video clips, interview segments, etc. from the video in response to extraction of the datum (for title, video clips, image, etc.) from the video for inclusion in video summary including video clips, interview segments, image, or video title, etc. (par. 0119-par. 0129, figures 23-24, 29, 30, 32-33).

Regarding claim 12, Boyer teaches a method of abstracting video comprising the steps of:

locating an index of the video in at least on of a worldwide web site and a program guide (locating video information such as title, running time, channel, etc. of a video from web server 86 and a program guide – figures 3, 16 and par. 0089, par. 0119-par. 0129);

identification of a domain of the video for creating a video abstraction by a user (identification By Time, by Channel, by Category, etc. for creating a video program guide – figures 15-16 and par. 0089, par. 0119-par. 0129);

using the domain together with the index to identify portions of the video for inclusion in the video abstraction (e.g. using By time, By Channel, By Category, etc.

together with index (title, running time, channel, images, etc.) to identify video clips,

interview segments, description, etc. for inclusion in the video program guide – figures

16, 23-24, 26, 29, 30, 32-33 and par. 0105, par. 0119-par. 0129);

extracting the identified portions of the video from the video to form the video

abstraction (e.g. extracting images, description, video clips, title, etc. of the video from

the video to form the image, title, video clip, etc. on the pages of video program guide –

figures 16, 20, 23-24, 26, 29-30, 32-33, par. 0119-par. 0129).

Conclusion

4.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to

applicant's disclosure.

Elenbaas et al. (US 2005/0028194) discloses personalized news retrieval system.

5.   **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time

policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within

TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any

extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later

than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to Son P. Huynh whose telephone number is 571-272-

7295. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00 - 6:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Christopher S. Kelley can be reached on 571-272-7331. The fax phone

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-

273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SPH
February 24, 2006

HAI TRAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER